UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,067	10/22/2003	Michael James Tully	36194/42366	7243

21888   7590   05/06/2008
THOMPSON COBURN, LLP
ONE US BANK PLAZA
SUITE 3500
ST LOUIS, MO 63101

EXAMINER
ZECHER, MICHAEL R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3691	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/06/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

IPDOCKET@THOMPSONCOBURN.COM

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/692,067	TULLY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MICHAEL R. ZECHER	3691	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _28 February 2008_.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☐ Claim(s) _1-90_ is/are pending in the application.
　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _36-81 and 87-90_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☐ Claim(s) _1-35 & 82-86_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _22 October 2003_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
　　a) ☐ All　b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _4/6/2005_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The following is a first, non-final Office Action on the merits. The Response to

Election/Restriction received February 28, 2008, has been entered. Applicant elected

Group I (**claims 1-35 & 82-86**) without traverse. **Claims 1-35 & 82-86** are now

pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2.   Due to extremely voluminous prior art citation by the Applicants, the Examiner

has only given each reference a cursory review. Applicants are invited to provide

comments regarding the most relevant pieces of prior art including how the claims of the

instant application are patentable over those relevant pieces.

Claim Objections

3.   **Claim 20** is objected to because of the following informalities: TCP/IP needs to

be spelled out the first time it appears in the claim language. Appropriate correction is

required.

4.   **Claim 22** is objected to because of the following informalities: COM needs to be

spelled out the first time it appears in the claim language. Appropriate correction is

required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

6.   **Claims 1-35 & 82-86** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed

invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1 recites in the preamble "an automated brokerage system for processing activity request related to financial instruments, the system comprising." The body of claim 1 recites various "layers" in each limitation, including "a front end layer," "an intermediate layer," "a back end layer," etc. Claim 1 is considered non-statutory because the layers are considered to be software, per se. Functional Descriptive material per se is not statutory. Functional Descriptive material in combination with an appropriate computer readable medium must be capable of producing a useful, concrete and tangible result when used in a computer system. Since the "layers" lack storage on a medium and there are no instructions in executable form, no underlying functionality occurs and thus there is no practical application. For these reasons, claim 1 fails to satisfy one of the statutory categories set form in 35 U.S.C. 101 and is therefore considered to be non-statutory.

Claims 2-35 are dependent from claim 1 and stand rejected under the same rationale set forth above.

Claim 82 recites in the preamble "In an automated financial instrument brokerage system configured… a method comprising." It is unclear whether claim 82 is a system or method claim. Clarification is required. For examination purposes, Examiner has construed claim 82 as a method claim.

Claims 83-86 are dependent from claim 82 and stand rejected under the same rationale set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8.   **Claims 82-86** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

      Claim 82 recites in the preamble "In an automated financial instrument

brokerage system configured… a method comprising." It is unclear whether **claim 82** is

a system or method claim. Clarification is required. For examination purposes,

Examiner has construed **claim 82** as a method claim.

      Claims 83-86 are dependent from claim 82 and stand rejected under the same

rationale set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public
> use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United
> States.

10.   **Claims 1-11, 16, 18, 20, 21, 27-32, 34-35, & 82** are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mulinder et al. (U.S. 2002/0073018).

      As per claim 1, Mulinder et al. teaches an automated brokerage system for

processing activity requests related to financial instruments (See abstract, which

discusses a system for real-time trading services), the system comprising:

      a front end layer comprising a plurality of applications configured to generate

activity requests related to one or more financial instruments in response to input from

remote users (See paragraphs 9 & 45, which discusses multiple applications, including

a price request application program interface for trading securities);

an intermediate layer in communication with the front end layer, the intermediate

layer comprising a plurality of servers for processing the generated activity requests, the

servers being configured to provide a set of services in connection with the processing

of the activity requests (See paragraphs 9 &43, which discusses various servers and

modules); and

a back end layer in communication with the intermediate layer, the back end

layer comprising a data source configured to provide financial instrument quote data, a

data repository configured to store customer account data, and an order placement

system configured to place one or more orders on a financial instrument trading market,

the one or more orders being derived from at least one received activity request (See

paragraph 64, which discusses using a conventional database management system);

and

wherein the intermediate layer servers are configured to interact with the back

end layer data source, the back end layer data repository, and the back end layer order

placement system as necessary to process the received activity requests (See figures 1

& 2, which illustrates a system for providing trading services).

As per claim 2, Mulinder et al. teaches wherein the intermediate layer servers

comprise a plurality of dedicated servers, each dedicated server being configured to

provide a different set of services in connection with the processing of the activity

requests (See paragraph 43, which discusses numerous servers and modules interacting to perform trading services).

As per claim 3, Mulinder et al. teaches wherein the intermediate layer dedicated servers comprise:

at least one order server configured to receive and process order activity requests from the front end layer (See paragraphs 12 & 44, which discusses processing a trade in a security);

at least one customer account server configured to receive and process customer account activity requests from the front end layer, wherein the processing of customer account activity requests includes interacting with the back end layer data repository to retrieve customer account data therefrom and providing the retrieved customer account data to the front end applications for display to the users (See paragraphs 13 & 49, which discusses monitoring a clients trading patterns and market activity, thereby creating a client account); and

at least one quote server configured to receive and process quote activity requests from the front end layer, wherein the processing of quote activity requests includes interacting with the back end layer data source to retrieve the financial instrument quote data therefrom and providing the retrieved financial instrument quote data to the front layer applications for display to the users (See paragraph 11-13 & 43-44, which discusses a quote engine capable of providing a plurality of quotes, each of which has a specified duration).

As per claim 4, Mulinder et al. teaches wherein the order server is further configured to interact with the customer account server to obtain customer account data therefrom (See paragraph 50, which discusses processing a transaction utilizing client account information).

As per claim 5, Mulinder et al. teaches wherein the order server is further configured to interact with the quote server to obtain financial instrument activity requests (See paragraph 11-13 & 43-44, which discusses a quote engine capable of providing a plurality of quotes, each of which has a specified duration, when processing a trade in a security).

As per claim 6, Mulinder et al. teaches wherein the intermediate layer further comprises a database schema configured to store data related to receive activity requests (See paragraph 13, 49, & 64, which discusses a conventional database management system; and, furthermore, monitoring a clients trading patterns and market activity, thereby creating a client account).

As per claim 7, Mulinder et al. teaches wherein the database schema (See paragraph 64, which discusses using a conventional database management system) comprises:

at least one customer database for storing customer-specific data (See paragraphs 13 & 49, which discusses monitoring a clients trading patterns and market activity, thereby creating a client account); and

at least one order database for storing order-specific data (See paragraphs 12 & 44, which discusses processing a trade in a security).

As per claim 8, Mulinder et al. teaches wherein the database schema further comprises at least one trading administration database for storing administrative restrictions related to activity requests (See paragraphs 46 & 49, which discusses spread rules and dealer intervention rules).

As per claim 9, Mulinder et al. teaches wherein the database schema further comprises a plurality of the customers databases, a plurality of the orders databases, and a plurality of the trading administration databases (See paragraphs 12, 13, 44, 49, & 64, which discusses a conventional database management system; and, furthermore, monitoring a clients trading patterns and market activity, thereby creating a client account, when processing a trade in a security).

As per claim 10, Mulinder et al. teaches an administrator interface for controlling the content of the trading administration database (See paragraphs 44 & 54, which discusses a flow manager who coordinates and processes trades).

As per claim 11, Mulinder et al. teaches wherein the administrator interface is configured to provide an administrator with control over restrictions on at least one of the group consisting of a financial instrument-specific basis, a trading market-specific bases, and an option-specific basis (See paragraphs 44 & 54 which discusses a flow manager who coordinates and processes trades based on risk analysis and market volatility).

As per claim 16, Mulinder et al. teaches wherein the customer account server include memory resident thereon for storing customer account data that has previously been retrieved from the back end data repository (See paragraphs 13 & 49, which

discusses monitoring a clients trading patterns and market activity, thereby creating a

client account), and wherein the customer account server is further configured to utilize

the customer account data that has been stored in the resident memory according to

predetermined criteria when processing customer account activity requests (See

paragraphs 49 & 50, which discusses client information in relation to dealer intervention

rules, including credit related factors).

Claim 18 recites equivalent limitations to claim 16 and is therefore rejected using

the same art and rationale set forth above.

As per claim 20, Mulinder et al. teaches wherein the front end layer and the

intermediate layer communicate with each other according to the TCP/IP protocol (See

paragraph 43, which discusses communications protocol, including the internet).

Claim 21 recites equivalent limitations to claim 20 and is therefore rejected using

the same art and rationale set forth above.

As per claim 27, Mulinder et al. teaches wherein the back end data source

comprises at least one quote feed, the at least one quote feed providing quote data in a

data format to the quote server, and wherein the quote server is further configured to

convert the received quote data to an internal data format upon receipt thereof (See

paragraphs 11-13, 43-44, & 46 which discusses a quote engine capable of proving a

plurality of quotes, each of which has a specified duration; and, furthermore, utilizing a

number of factors when describing price quote generation).

As per claim 28, Mulinder et al. teaches wherein the back end data source

comprises a plurality of quote feeds, at least two of the quote feeds providing quote data

in different data formats, and wherein the quote server is further configured to convert quote data received from each of the quote feeds to the internal data format upon receipt thereof (See paragraphs 11-13, 43-44, & 46, which discusses a quote engine capable of providing a plurality of quotes, each of which has a specified duration; and, furthermore, utilizing a number of factors when describing the price quote generation factor).

As per claim 29, Mulinder et al. teaches wherein the quote data comprises a plurality of quote data types (See paragraphs 11-13 & 43-44, which discusses a quote engine capable of providing a plurality of quotes, each of which has a specified duration), and wherein the system further comprises an administrator interface configured to select, in response to administrator input, which of a plurality of quote feeds are to be used for receiving each of the plurality of quote data types (See paragraph 44, which discusses how a dealer intervention module may be used by a trader to control the pricing and trading activity).

As per claim 30, Mulinder et al. teaches wherein the back end layer further comprises a plurality of the data repositories, and wherein the intermediate layer servers are configured to interact with both the back end data repositories when processing activity requests (See paragraph 64, which discusses using a conventional database management system).

As per claim 31, Mulinder et al. teaches an approval desk interface configured to provide a person with control over whether to approve or reject order activity requests routed thereto, and wherein the order server is further configured to determine whether

an activity request is to be routed to the approval desk (See paragraph 51, which

discusses how the trader may reject or modify the price request).

   As per claim 32, Mulinder et al. teaches an automated brokerage system (See

abstract, which discusses a system for real-time trading services), the system

comprising:

   a plurality of applications configured to generate activity requests related to one

or more financial instruments in response to input from remote users, the activity

requests comprising any of the group consisting of order activity requests, customer

account activity requests, and quote activity requests (See paragraphs 9 & 45, which

discusses multiple applications, including a price request application program interface

for trading securities);

   at least one order server configured to process the order activity requests (See

paragraphs 12 & 44, which discusses processing a trade in a security);

   at least one customer account server configured to process the customer

account activity requests (See paragraphs 13 & 49, which discusses monitoring a

clients trading patterns and market activity, thereby creating a client account);

   at least one quote server configured to process the quote activity requests (See

paragraphs 11-13 & 43-44, which discusses a quote engine capable of providing a

plurality of quotes, each of which has a specified duration);

   at least one quote data source in communication with the at least one quote

server, the quote data source being configured to provide financial instrument quote

data to the quote server (See paragraphs 11-13 & 43-44, which discusses a quote

engine capable of providing a plurality of quotes, each of which has a specified duration, when processing a trade in a security);

at least one data repository in communication with the at least one customer account server and the at least one order server, the data repository being configured to store customer account data and provide stored customer account data to the customer account server (See paragraphs 50 & 64, which discusses using a conventional database management system and processing a transaction utilizing client account information); and

at least one order placement system in communication with the order server, the order placement system being configured to place one or more orders received from the order server on a financial instrument trading market, the one or more orders being derived from at least one order activity request (See figures 1 & 2, which illustrates the system for providing trading services).

Claim 34 recites equivalent limitations to claim 16 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

As per claim 35, Mulinder et al. teaches wherein the order server is further configured to, when processing order activity requests, generate quote activity requests for communication to the quote server, and wherein the quote server is further configured to provide quote data that has been obtained in response to the quote activity request received from the order server to the order server (See paragraphs 11-13 & 43-44, which discusses processing a trade in a security requests and a quote

engine capable of providing a plurality of quotes, each of which has a specified

duration).

Claim 82 recites equivalent limitations to claim 1 and is therefore rejected using

the same art and rationale set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12.   **Claims 12-15 & 33** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Mulinder et al. (U.S. 2002/0073018), and further in view of Bowman-Amuah (U.S.

6,578,068).

As per claim 12, Mulinder et al. teaches wherein the intermediate layer further

comprises: a plurality of the order servers (See paragraphs 12 & 44, which discusses

processing a trade in a security).

However, Mulinder et al. does not disclose a load balancer that interfaces with

the front end applications with the plurality of order servers, the load balancer being

configured to distribute order activity requests among the plurality of order servers.

Bowman-Amuah discloses a system and method for distributing information

amongst a client and server components for optimizing usage of resources.

Both Mulinder et al. and Bowman-Amuah disclose methods and systems for

distributing information within a trading or ordering contexts. Bowman-Amuah discloses

a load balancer that mediates the request, otherwise known as workload balancing (See figure 151 and column 98, lines 22-49, which discusses how load balancing functionality effectively reduces the number of connections to databases, conserves the resources of the data servers, and increases throughput of the system). Therefore, it would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mulinder et al. to include a load balancer capable of distributing ordering activity requests over a plurality of servers as taught by Bowman-Amuah in order to combine the known features of trading systems and load balancing to achieve the predictable result of utilizing load balancing in a trading system to conserve resources and increase throughput.

As per claim 13, Mulinder et al. teaches wherein the intermediate layer further comprises: a plurality of the customer account servers (See paragraph 13 & 49, which discusses monitoring a clients trading patterns and market activity, thereby creating a client account).

However, Mulinder et al. does not disclose a load balancer that interfaces the front end applications with the plurality of customer account servers, the load balancer being configured to distribute customer account activity requests among the plurality of customer account servers.

Bowman-Amuah discloses a load balancer that mediates the request, otherwise known as workload balancing (See figure 151 and column 98, lines 22-49, which discusses how load balancing functionality effectively reduces the number of connections to databases, conserves the resources of the data servers, and increases

throughput of the system). Therefore, it would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mulinder et al. to include a load balancer capable of distributing customer activity requests over a plurality of servers as taught by Bowman-Amuah in order to combine the known features of trading systems and load balancing to achieve the predictable result of utilizing load balancing in a trading system to conserve resources and increase throughput.

As per claim 14, Mulinder et al. teaches wherein the intermediate layer further comprises: a plurality of the quote servers (See paragraph 11-13 & 43-44, which discusses a quote engine capable of providing a plurality of quotes, each of which has a specified duration).

However, Mulinder et al. does not disclose a load balancer that interfaces with the front end applications with the plurality of quote servers, the load balancer being configured to distribute quote activity requests among the plurality of quote servers.

Bowman-Amuah discloses a load balancer that mediates the request, otherwise known as workload balancing (See figure 151 and column 98, lines 22-49, which discusses how load balancing functionality effectively reduces the number of connections to databases, conserves the resources of the data servers, and increases throughput of the system). Therefore, it would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mulinder et al. to include a load balancer capable of distributing quote activity requests over a plurality of servers as taught by Bowman-Amuah in order to combine the known features of trading

systems and load balancing to achieve the predictable result of utilizing load balancing

in a trading system to conserve resources and increase throughput.

Claims 15 & 33 recites equivalent limitations to claims 12-14, respectively, and is

therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

13.   **Claims 17, 19, 22-26, & 83-86** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Mulinder et al. (U.S. 2002/0073018), and further in view of Official

Notice.

As per claim 17, Mulinder et al. does not disclose wherein the resident memory

is application-in-memory cache.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to store

memory on a cache. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mulinder et al. to include storing

memory on an application-in-memory cache in order to making accessing memory a

faster process.

Claim 19 recites equivalent limitations to claim 17 and is therefore rejected using

the same art and rationale set forth above.

As per claim 22, Mulinder et al. does not disclose wherein a plurality of the front

end applications are heterogeneous applications configured to communicate with the

intermediate layer through a plurality of common COM objects.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to use

component object model to assemble programs or add functionality to existing

programs. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to modify Mulinder et al. to include a component

object model in order to link programs and add functionality.

As per claim 23, Mulinder et al. teaches order activity requests stored on an

order server (See paragraphs 12 & 44, which discusses processing a trade in a

security).

However, Mulinder et al. does not disclose wherein the front layer COM objects

include a COM object for communicating order activity requests to the order server.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to use

component object model to assemble programs or add functionality to existing

programs. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to modify Mulinder et al. to include a component

object model that allows communication with order requests on an order server in order

to link programs and add functionality.

As per claim 24, Mulinder et al. teaches wherein the intermediate layer further

comprises at least one trading administration database for storing administrative

restrictions related to activity requests (See paragraphs 46 & 49, which discusses

spread rules and dealer intervention rules).

However, Mulinder et al. does not disclose wherein the front end layer COM

objects further include COM object for validating an order activity request against

restrictions stored in the trading administration database prior to forwarding that order

activity request to the order server.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to use component object model to assemble programs or add functionality to existing programs. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mulinder et al. to include a component object model capable of validating trade requests against intervention in order to link programs and add functionality.

As per claim 25, Mulinder et al. teaches customer account activity requests stored on a customer account server (See paragraph 13 & 49, which discusses monitoring a clients trading patterns and market activity, thereby creating a client account).

However, Mulinder et al. does not disclose wherein the front end layer COM objects further include a COM object for communicating customer account activity requests to the customer account server.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to use component object model to assemble programs or add functionality to existing programs. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mulinder et al. to include a component object model that allows communication with customer account activity requests on an customer account server in order to link programs and add functionality.

As per claim 26, Mulinder et al. teaches quote activity requests stored on a quote server (See paragraphs 11-13 & 43-44, which discusses a quote engine capable of providing a plurality of quotes, each of which has a specified duration).

However, Mulinder et al. does not disclose wherein the front end layer COM objects further include a COM object for communicating quote activity requests to the quote server.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to use component object model to assemble programs or add functionality to existing programs. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mulinder et al. to include a component object model that allows communication with quote activity requests on an quote server in order to link programs and add functionality.

Claims 83-86 recite equivalent limitations to claims 22-23 & 25-26, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same rationale set forth above.

Conclusion

14.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Penney et al. (U.S. 2004/0143539) discloses a method and apparatus for trading assets.

Penney et al. (U.S. 2003/0149653) discloses a method and apparatus for conducting financial transactions.

Mulinder et al. (U.S. 7,340,460) discloses real-time trading system.

Fijolek et al. (U.S. 7,068,597) discloses a system and method for automatic load balancing in a data-over-cable network.

Lewis (U.S. 6,513,019) discloses financial consolidating and communication platform.

Kitchen et al. (U.S. 2003/0018561) single party buying and selling commodities with multiple counterparties.

Kitchen et al. (U.S. 2002/0138400) discloses buying and selling goods and services using automated method and apparatus.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL R. ZECHER whose telephone number is (571)270-3032. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00 alt. Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alexander Kalinowski/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3691

MRZ